FILED

NO (1) 021564 APR 22 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITE STATES

October term 2002

ARLIN EDWARD RANEY — PETITIONER

vs

LINDA MARTHA RANEY, — Apellee/Petitioner
Counsel for appellee
Kermit L. Racey Sr. Esquire
115 W. Court St.
Woodstock, Va. 22664----------(540) 459-3620

vs

Linda M. Raney, **Trustee** — Appellee/Petitioner
Linda M. Raney
Counsel for appellee
Layman & Nichols, P.C.
268 Newman Ave.
Harrisonburg, Va. 22801----------(540) 4332121

Vs

Dagny Virginia Raney, beneficiary----------interested party
Arlin John Raney, beneficiary----------interested party
Counsel for interested party children
R. Daren Bostic, Esquire, Ad-Litem
57 So. Main St. suite 306
Harrisonburg, Va. 22801----------(540) 432-0636

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To: THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

Arlin Edward Raney, pro-se
1020 Old Furnace Rd.
Harrisonburg, Va. 22802
(540) 434-4928

35 pp

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

1.Does the Appeal Court Of Virginia **clerk** have authority to dismiss a "[**case appealed from**] " to the Supreme Court Of Virginia, **court appealed to**?

2. Did the clerk { Ms. Sharon L. Kelly }, a clerk of The Appeals Court Of Virginia { " **improbity dismiss** ", Supreme Court Of Virginia case No.022254 ?

3. Is, The Supreme Court Of Virginia **Order**, dated Tuesday, the 12th Day of November, 2002, Arlin E. Raney ---Appellant,--- against record No. 022254, ---Court Of Appeals Nos. 0463-02-4 and 0937-02-4, **forgery** (b) reflecting possible evidence, court of Virginia **improbity infiltration**?

4. Was Appellant Raney properly administered his day of **Interlocutory appeal** by The Appeal Court of Virginia ?

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED CONTINUED

5. Was the appellant interlocutory appeal No.0937-02-04 " **return** " to the circuit court, subsequent dismissal stating never received, appeal court clerk error?

6. Did the circuit court properly **evidence**, the removed trustee testimony admitting , past incarceration in mental institutions, and subsequent incarceration for theft, reflect error in the courts denial of fathers visitation request ?

7. Was the **interlocutory** inlimine appeal dismissal (with-out remanding to circuit court, Injunction jury trial) " error " (under both State & USA constitution law), as **necessary** for fair or equitable CH95-41, equitable property distribution judgment, the circuit court, with-out jury trial requested, **arbitrary** discretion to **extend,** a " temporary contested airport injunction " for four years, whereby the court

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED CONTINUED

timely determined, without jury trial. Appellant personal trust stock issue **created** a **shareholder agreement,** the court arbitrary determining a share holder time limit was up, with-out requested jury trial, the court arbitrary dissolving the company to the injunction filer} With-out requested jury trial, additionally the court awarding the airport co. assets (17 airplanes & equipment) to removed trustee filer, who admitted to the court having been (among other things) incarcerated in mental institutions and having been incarcerated for theft, to the court, the judge personally by note recorded, in-fact oath testimony the court personally, requested **removed trustee** material fact repeat , **is severe** court discretion **error**?

8. Is court with-held document evidence, circuit court discretion error?

9. Is the moral conscious of the USA Supreme court prompted to send a message " Fraud " by clerks of all courts will not be encouraged or tolerated ?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions presented----------next to cover

Table of contents----------ii

Constitutional provisions, statutes, & reg. Involved------iii

Statutes cited----------iv

Opinions below----------2,3

Statement of jurisdiction----------4

Statement of the case----------5 thru 12

Reason for granting the petition----------14

Conclusion----------13

APPENDIX

Appendix (A), Ms. Sheron L. Kelly, forgery dismissal of The Supreme Court Of Virginia record No.022254-------1a

Appendix (B), Appeals Ct. Clerk return of " Statements Of facts ", clerk improperly used to dismiss appeal------3a

Appendix (C), clerk orders to dismiss-0463-02-4--------5a

Appendix (D), clerk order to dismiss –0937-02-4-------7a

Appendix (E),Circuit Ct. CH95-34 injunction order,----9a

Appendix (F)-recorded family trust trustee removal---12a

Appendix (G)—Airport stock issue right agreement---14a

Appendix (H) Blacks interlocutory definition---------15a

Appendix (I) Children visitation application---------16a

Constitution provisions, statutes & reg. Involved

U.S.C.A. Constitution Amendment 7

---

62 Federal Practice Digest 4th. page 392, **interlocutory injunctions**, "A" Grounds, proceedings to procure, key 132 " Nature & Scope "

D.C. CAL. 1985, very purpose of preliminary injunction is to prevent Irreparable loss of rights before injunction . Nat'l. Org. for reform of marijuana laws, (normal) v. Mullen, 608 F Supp. 945, cause remanded 796 F 2d. 276.

D.C.D.C. 1985, grant of preliminary Injuncion is a drastic & unusual judicial measure, award of such relief is " NOT " a matter of right, even though petitioner claims & may incur irreparable injury, Marine Transport v. Lehman, 623 F. Supp. 330.

N.D. ILL. 1990, preliminary injunction is a extraordinary remedy & " MOVANT MUST " make a clear showing that **she is entitled** to such relief, Haussman v. Chicago Brd. Of Education, 773 F Supp. 56.

---

iii continued

93 FPD 4th--75, III , Appointment—tenure—Of Trustee
Trust key 164 " **Removal** ", key 166(1) **grounds,**

C.A.4 (VA) 1989. Under Virginia Law, " good cause existed for removal of trustee, in RE: A. H. Robins Co. Inc. , 880 F. 2d. 779, Under VA. Law, trustee may be removed upon showing of fraud or gross negligence, disharmony, animosity and friction among trustees supports removal of Trustee.

---

64 FPD 3d.—215, II, right to jury trial by jury

C.A. FLA. 1980, Dist. CTs. Should grant jury trial in absence of strong And compelling reasons to the contrary ! F.R.C.Pro., rule 39(b), 28 U.S. C. A., Mesa Petroleum Co. v. Coniglio, 629 F 2d. 1020

It is distressful for appellant to copy case laws in that NO TWO CASES though similar are unique if limited perpetrator or multiple perpetrators by purpose, intent, Circumstances, mitigate the offense, it is very much that reason juries must determine matters of guilt.

Statutes Cited Page

103 Federal Practice Digest 3d –248, Key 166(2) 5 thru 12
Mismanagement or misconduct in execution of trust
District Court Arkansas (1979):
a trust is expression of property rights of Settlor,
Busby v. Northern Bnk. & Trust Co. N.A., 184 F Supp. 647
103 FPD 3d --248—key 164 " removal " 5 thru 12
Key 166 " Grounds " C.A.R. 1 (1984)
Trustee can be removed even if charges of misconduct
Are not made out, Dennis v. Rhode Island Hospital
Trust N. Bnk., 744 F 2d 983
64 FPD 3 d—15, " JURY " " Nature and Constitution 5 thru 12
of Juries, key 1., " nature & function " C.J.S. SS 1, 2.
C.A.Cal. (1984) , Juries have dual purpose, to prevent
Government oppression & in civil cases to assure fair &
Equitable resolution of factual issues, whether state or
Individual desires jury. , U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 7
Standard Oil v. Arizona, 105 S. Ct. 815, 83 L Ed. 2d. 807,
64 FPD 3 d –15, right to trial by Jury, C. A. FLA. (1980) 5 thru 12
Courts should grant jury trial in absence of compelling
Reasons to the contrary, F.R.C.Pr., 39(b) 28 USCA,
Mesa Pet. Co. v. Coniglio, 629 F. 2d 1020

Statutes Cited

Having read, most remanded appeals court remands are referred to as, remanded for other reasons, Therefore picks other reasons to cite,

remand for fair " Injunction " jury trial,

With exception to amendment 7, " right to Jury ", amendment 5, " otherwise infamous crime ", indictment by a grand jury , amend. 6 other, amend 1' petition the government, article 3, sec 1, judges to hold office in good behavior, sec. 2 . the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under this constitution

Certificate of service this date mailed: Rule 29(a) is to

Solicitor, General, & Attorney General, of the USA, Dept. of Justice, Rm. 5614, 10th & Conn. Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530
Kermit Racey, Esq., 115 W. Ct. St. Box 250, Woodstock, Va. 22664
Layman & Nichols, P.C.,268 Newmsn Ave., Harrisonburg, Va. 22801
Daren Bostic, Esq. 57 So. Main St. Suite 306, Harrisonburg, Va. 22801
Dennis Hupp, Judge, 112 So. Main St. , Woodstock, Va. 22664-0250
Mr. David Beach, Clerk, Sup.Ct.Va., 100 N. 9th St., Rich., Va. 23219
Ms. McCoy, Ms. Graham, Mr. Vollino, Ms. Kelly, Clerks of The Court Of Appeals Of Va., 109 N. 8th St., Rich., Va. 23210-2305

NO_____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITE STATES

October term 2002

ARLIN EDWARD RANEY,

Petitioner,

vs

LINDA MARTHA RANEY, Apellee/Petitioner
Counsel for appellee
Kermit L. Racey Sr. Esquire
115 W. Court St.
Woodstock, Va. 22664----------(540) 459-3620

vs

Linda M. Raney, **Trustee** Appellee/Petitioner
Linda M. Raney
Counsel for appellee
Layman & Nichols, P.C.
268 Newman Ave.
Harrisonburg, Va, 22801----------(540) 4332121

Vs

Dagny Virginia Raney, beneficiary----------interested party
Arlin John Raney, beneficiary----------interested party
Counsel for interested party children
R. Daren Bostic, Esquire, Ad-Litem
57 So. Main St. suite 306
Harrisonburg, Va. 22801----------(540) 432-0636

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To: THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

OPINIONS BELOW

The case was never heard by the Supreme Court Of Virginia which court assigned a case No.022254, which represented appellants Appeals Court Of Virginia Interlocutory appeal)0937-02-04 & final order appeal 0463-02-4, **both improbity dismissed** by the clerk of the Appeals Court Of Virginia, Ms. Sharon L. Kelly's, flagrant, blatant, fraud **forgery** of Supreme Court Of Virginia, case 022254 order , the crux of this petition, a concise statement of the case begins (page 5), the first three questions to be answered, specifically addresses, No. 3. question, inquires, noted at appendix (A), Ms. Kelly is **not a clerk** of the supreme court of Virginia who's flagrant judicial improbity encourages use by the judicial system clerks of the judicial system, to **deny** 300 million USA citizens constitution mandated fair justice at will.

The Appeals Court Of Virginia clerk returned appellant circuit court final order appeal No. 0463-02-4, April 24, 2002 claimed filed April 19,2002 Noting it appears the applicable time limits for filing a "**Statement of facts** " in lieu of no transcript or Transcript, have not yet passed,

OPINIONS BELOW CONTINUED

retyped at Appendix (B) herein noted, copied in the Supreme Court Of Virginia record No.022254 at appendix 33 appeal.

The appeals court clerk of Virginia subsequently, blantantly incomprehensibly , dismissed appellant circuit court interlocutory appeal Ch95-41/CH95-34 appeals court No. 0937-02-4 & circuit court Final Order Ch95-41, appeals court No. 0463-02-4 by (two **separate** clerk orders) both dated 8-28-2002 , typed noted at appendix (C&D) herein, as duplicated in the Supreme Court Of Virginia record No.022254 appeal, at appendix (30), **falsely** stating, quote: Neither a transcript nor **a statement of facts** was " TIMELY " filed in this case, claiming this order shall be certified to the trial court, for which " the interlocutory appeal " specifically complained, the circuit court " Injunction CH95-34 " never " scheduled a jury trial , **the court ordered** September 7, 1995 & **failed to schedule**, retyped at appendix (E) herein as appearing in Supreme Court Of Virginia appeal, appendix (16).

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of The Supreme Court Of Virginia entered on Friday the 28th day of February 2003 against Record No. 022254, a consolidation of the court of appeals of Virginia, record Nos. 0937-02-4 (interlocutory CH95-41, collateral CH95-34, circuit court of Shenandoah County) and the court of appeals of Virginia collateral record No. 0463-02-4 (final order Ch95-41 circuit court of Shenandoah County).

The jurisdiction is invoked under U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 7.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE
FLAGRANT BLATANT FRAUDULENT

state of Virginia, Shenandoah County Circuit Court, case number CH95-34, as tried & **criminally dismissed in the State Supreme Court** Of Virginia Styled, Raney, Vs. Raney, a **injunction action** , precisely a AIRPORT INJUNCTION, filed March 7, 1995, by Linda to injunction , appellant Ed. Raney right to operate his own fee airport, Ed., as un-married, single fee owner, who suffered disability (by confinement) & (improper Trustee confiscation of Ed. devised trust fund res) , restricting Ed's. ability, to hire injunction defense, of the airport he owned in fee, had developed as founder, a successful flight school, built & rented 20 aircraft storage hangers, developed a successful fuel sales operation, however, " Ed. " improperly, fathering two beautiful children. Ed. was exceptionally proud of, loved very much, both siblings, by one of Ed's invasion students **(Linda),** Ed. 32 years senior to Linda, in caution regarding the uncertainty of life (particularly at age 60 in year 1988) desiring to protect the future of his beloved siblings, Dagny & Arlin, devised a un-revoke-able, Raney family trust, devising 1/3 to each beneficiary, mother, daughter, & son. Ed. as devisor & sole family trust

res contributor, with " Linda's ", historic character un-known, Ed. instinctive trusting in maternity, appointed Linda', family trust " Trustee ", however, conditioning the infant beneficiaries un-revoke-able trust was not liquidate-able until the 25th birth date of siblings, occurring in year 2012. Ed. while desiring Linda, complete independence **" EXCEPTED "** Linda from, (1) any airport administration, both verbally & signature signed document, see appendix (G), (2) **requesting** family moral integrity by trust.

Prior to Ed. defense confinement disability, December 11, 1994, Ed. trained, airport personnel, to operate the airport if confined, to limited airport liability operation risk, (**no flight school**) (**no transit aircraft rental**), accommodating only, (1) hanger storage rentals to private aircraft owners (2) fuel sales to locals & transits. Shortly after Ed's 12-11-1994 confinement, Ed. " by necessity " **removed Linda** as Raney family trust, **trustee,** following airport employee written notice to Ed., including evidence, Linda was operating the airport, contrary to employee understanding, **violating** Ed's airport limited risk operation, Linda endorsed, **stating** Ed's **exclusive** 100% non transferable airport operation right, " **employee's** " furnishing Ed., a 5 x 7 . Daily News

Record, **display add**, advertising, (Mr. Maurice Starke) as new airport **flight operation manager** & flight instructor, a severe personal & trust, trustee prohibited involvement, disrupting the airport personnel.

After Linda , family trust " TRUSTEE " removal, see appendix (F), Linda, improbity [Laymond & Nichols, P C] filed a " **airport** injunction, **CH95-34**, ", falsely claiming to the circuit court, Linda. (**owned the airport**), falsely, claiming, adverse to documentation, Ed. was doing ir-repairable damage to "**her airport**" , using millions (in cash & endorsed consignment) of **family trust beneficiary assets**, she controlled as family trust trustee, the circuit court injuncted & failed to protect, the **infant children** paramount, **trust beneficiary interest**. the circuit court waiting five years to assign the children a attorney, ostensible to protect the children interest, waiting until " after " Eds. confinement disability release, until Ed. filed for **children** visitation, see appendix (I), the court then used the **belated** (by 5 years) children assigned attorney to deny paternal visitation, Ed believes the court in bias , with-out notice to Ed., prejudiced Ed., changing Ed's **requested**

paternal visitation hearing, to a **court claimed** "evidence " hearing , using the **court assigned** children attorney, to " CHARGE " Ed., with-out notice, **Ed. intended to harm the mother trustee**, the court never addressing the father requested paternal visitation hearing the court denied. Appellant, with-out funds, as disability confined, by pin letter had complained these recited circumstances to the county circuit court , sharing with the court , employee provided 5 X 7 add of evidence advertising Mr. Starcke as airport operation manager, for which trustee was removed, the trustee then filing Ch95-34 Airport Injunction, she did not own nor business owned, the trustee was prohibited from operating , **in-fact**, Linda, was a paper stock holder, actually " holding " the airport stock **in trust** for Ed., the trustee falsely claiming , the stock was a gift from Ed. with-out documentation, Ed., noting to the court, the trustee dual filings in seven days, CH95-34 & CH95-41 indicated " IMPROBITY " retribution, sometimes called hate crime, Linda, filing CH95-41, divorce petition March 14, 1995, actually Linda, had " **only one** " family trust airport trustee duty, to privately check the airport books after closing, & employee departure. The circuit court defeated Eds.

Documents, by assigning Ed. A attorney of the courts choice, who, admirably, submitted Eds. letters to the court as both ad-litem & Ed's defense, objecting to the injunction, the court, ostensibly to protect Ed. in 1995, ordered the CH95-34 **injunction trial delayed,** see appendix (E), until Eds. release, to be set at the same time the CH95-41 equitable distribution trial was scheduled, { fair enough } except the circuit court , two years later " **violated the courts own protective order** " the ad-litem again admirably **objected to**.

After confinement disability removed, Appellant Ed. timely filed, for CH95-41 **children visitation**, see appendix (I), timely filed motioned **for injunction jury trial** and timely **Interlocutory** appealed the circuit court children visitation denial, including the courts failure to set the CH95-34, court ordered, injunction jury trial date, the court had ordered in 1995, Ed. proclaiming, { interlocutory appeal), no equitable CH95-41 distribution trial could be had until after the **airport injunction confiscation** , injunction jury trial, Ed. requested , & Ed. with-out funds, requested (informa-pauperus), the circuit court to provide, the court denied, the only court recorded

transcript of any Ch95-41 proceedings , Ed., requested the court, to 1st share the court judge notes (there was no clerk or recorder) ultimately filing a " Statement Of Facts " affecting both the CH95-41 **Interlocutory appeal** Ed filed January 2, 2000 " requesting the judges notes of coveted children visitation hearing that would affect the final CH95-41 judgment, where Linda admitted serious character material facts Linda's had under oath previously denied, two of five, (1) Incarcerated for **mental disorder** (2) later years incarcerated for theft), Ed. interlocutory appealed, that **should have tempered** the circuit courts judgment as Ed. interlocutory appealed to The Court Of Appeals Of Virginia, months prior to the Ch95-41 petition final order , appellant Ed. claiming , The CH95-34, Linda Airport injunction, " **criminal** " , appellant Ed. condemning the circuit court for granting a **temporary** injunction , maintaining the injunction for over four years, Linda, **perjury obtained,** Ed. submitting evidence he owned the airport in fee title, with general warranty title by properly recorded deed to the exclusion of others, excepting three Linda interests to wit: (1) a Quit Claim Deed granted to the petitioner trustee, granting a quit claim deed interest (Ed. **Quit Claimed** as tenant by the entirety), of Eds. airport home, noting; Ed., the fee grantor, **retained,**

100% **undivided interest** in the whole title until death (2) Ed., devised Linda, a 25 year un-revoke-able Family Trust 1/3 beneficiary interest, that did not liquidated until the 25th birth date of the 2/3 **beneficiary children devise interest**, not occurring until year 2012, (3) Linda's family trust, recited 25 year care of the children, **is the consideration** of the quit claim airport home deed grant Ed., appealed, { CH95-34[CH95-41 interlocutory]} to The Court Of Appeals Of Virginia, the court of appeals assigned the appeals court number 0937-02-04, containing Eds. request to the Circuit court for the courts judge recorded notes as there was no clerk, only the judge recorded notes, the judge denied Ed. included A statement of facts (**in lieu of no transcript**) the appeals court clerk returned , claiming the Statement of facts was not due for 45 days. Ed. appealed CH95-41 final order about April 1-2003, the appeals court assigned the number 0463-02-4, by timely notice to the Shenandoah County Circuit Court, The Appeal Court Of Virginia Clerk again, **returned** the appellant CH95-41 appeal " Statement Of Facts ", later **claiming** , the Appeals Court Of Virginia, **NEVER RECEIVED** the **STATEMENT OF FACTS**, therefore must **dismiss** the appeal. The appellant promptly appealed to the Supreme Court Of Virginia, The Supreme court assigning

Ed's the court Of Appeals numbers 0937-02-04 {interlocutory}& 0463-02-4 Final Order CH95-41 Final , a Supreme Court appeal case number 022254, the clerk of the appeal court of Virginia **CRIMINALLY DISMISSED** by stamping Mr. David Beach name to a Supreme Court Of Virginia order, the clerk created, signing the Supreme Court Of Virginia dismissal order, **falsely** claiming to be a clerk of the Supreme Court Of Virginia , criminally dismissing appellants appeal, exhausting appellants circuit court CH95-34 **travesty of justice** " Airport Injunction Appeal " & collateral CH95-41, improbity **removed trustee**, equitable distribution appeal .

BEST AVAI

CONCLUSION

The conclusion is a " **NO BRAINER** ", if documented evidence, pursuit of justice by fair trial is concerned ! 1. appellant right to removed a trustee , the circuit court & removed trustee failing to honor setlors trust intent. 2. appellant documents **appendix (F)** herein , recorded removal of trustee, (S. Ct. Va. Appendix 23) 3. Appellant stock issue agreement **intent**; desire; to protect the airport holdings, **appendix (G)** herein (S. Ct. Va. Appendix 19) retained 200 shares of stock holds **right to control** & is **not transferable**. 4. The circuit **court CH95-34 INJUNCTION ORDER**, Appendix (E) herein, the court ordered Sept. 7, 1995 & failed to honor, as failed to schedule the CH95-41 collateral equitable distribution **CH95-34 " injunction** trial " would be scheduled simultaneously.(S. Ct. Va. Appendix 16.) 5. **Where all of the above material facts are rendered moot by the overt improbity forgery appeal dismissal by the appeal court clerk " Ms. Sharon L. Kelly of the Supreme Court Of Virginia appeal .** See appendix A, B, C, Herein Supreme Court Of The United States appeal noted.

ABLE COPY

Reason for granting the petition

Send message, the Supreme Court **established justice** system, Supreme Court Justices will not tolerate court liaison of any type.

Send message the Supreme Court Constitution established justice system will not tolerate local ominous court rules, regulations designed or used to **sway** justice.

Send message the Supreme Court **will tolerate** local court rules, regulations established, that, **promote justice for all.**

Rectify circuit court justice the circuit court **denied** " trust setlors " **infant** family trust beneficiaries, the court waiting **5 years** to assign infant trust beneficiaries counsel to protect their CH95-34 **INJUNCTION** interest.

Send message, " all " court associates **representing** , any actions " MUST BE " biased " **preclused** " by the court or Counsel.

APPENDIX A---- Supreme Court Of Virginia Clerk Ms. Sharon L. Kelly **Forgery Dismissal** of The Supreme Court Of Virginia Record Number 022254.

VIRGINIA:

In The Supreme Court Of Virginia *held at Supreme Court Building in The City Of Richmond* on Tuesday *The* 12th. *day of* November , 2002,

Arlin E. Raney, Appellant,

Against Record No. 022254
Court Of Appeals Nos. 0463-02-4
and 0937-02-4

Linda Martha Raney Appellee

From The Court Of Appeals Of Virginia

Finding that the decision of the court of Appeals does not involve (1).

A substantial constitutional question as determinative issue, or (2) matters of significant precedential value, the court dismisses the petition for appeal filed

Appendix A

in the above-styled case. Code S- 17.1-410 (A) (3) and (B).

A Copy
Teste:

David B. Beach, Clerk
signed by Ms. Kelly
By: SHARON L. KELLY
Deputy Clerk

APPENDIX (B)----- Appeals court clerk **return** of " STATEMENT OF FACTS "

Court Of Appeals
Of Virginia
109 8th St.
Richmond, Va 23219-2321
April 24, 2002

Ms. Denise F. Barb
Clerk, Circuit Court of
Shenandoah County
112 South Main St.
Post Office Box 406
Woodstock, Va. 22664

Re: Arlin Edward Raney
v. Linda Martha Raney
Record No. 0463-02-4

Dear Ms. Barb:

I am returning herewith the record received in this office on April 19, 2002 in the above referenced case because it appears that the applicable appellate time limits for filing a statement of facts or transcript have not yet passed. Also, the manuscript record should include no more than 250 pages in a single volume.

Appendix B

(please refer to the attached yellow flyer.)

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sicerely yours

signed
Rosellis J. Graham

Deputy Clerk

GJG/lae
enclosures
Arlin Raney
Kermit L.Racey, Esq.
R. Darren Bostic, Esq.

Appendix (C)--- Clerk appeal dismissal **falsely** claiming **No Statement Of Facts**

VIRGINIA:

In the Court of Appeals of Virginia on **WEDNESDAY *THE* 28TH *DAY OF* august, 2002.**

Arlin Edward Raney, Appellant,

Against Record No 0463-02-4
Circuit No. CH 95-41
(January 23, 2002 order)

Linda Martha Raney, Appellee

From the Circuit Court of Shenandoah County

Neither a transcript nor a statement of facts was timely filed in this case. On June 28, 2002, the appellant , in proper person, responded to this Courts June 21, 2002 show-cause order.

as the appellant has failed to provide this court with any questions which can be decided without reference to a transcript or statement of facts, the case hereby is dismissed.

Appendix C

See: Anderson V. Commonwealth, 13 Va. App. 506, 413 S.E. 2d 75 (1992) ; Turner v. Commonwealth, 2 Va. App. 96, 341 S.E. 2d 400 (1986).

This order shall be certified to the trial court.

A copy,

Teste:

Cynthia L. McCoy, Clerk

By: _____signed_____

A.. John Vollino
Deputy Clerk

Appendix D---Clerk appeal dismissal **falsely** claiming **NO Statement Of Facts**

VIRGINIA:

***In the Court Of Appeals of Virginia on* Wednesday *the* 28th *day of* August , 2002.**

Arlin Edward Raney — Appellant,

Against — Record No. 0937-02-4
Circuit Court No. CH95-41
(January 23, 2002 order)

Linda Martha Raney, — Appellee

From the Circuit Court Of Shenandoah County

Neither a transcript nor a statement of facts was timely filed in this case. On June 28, 2002, the appellant, in proper person, responded to this courts June 21st., 2002 show cause-order.

as the appellant has failed to provide this court with any questions which can be decided without reference to a transcript or statement of facts, the case hereby is dismissed.

Appendix D

See: Anderson V. Commonwealth, 13 Va. App. 506 , 413 S.E. 2d. 75 (1992); Turner v. Commonwealth, 2 Va. App. 96. 341 S.E. 2d 400 (1986).

This order shall be certified to the trial court.

A copy,
Teste:

Cynthia L. McCoy, Clerk

By: _____signed_____

A. John Vollino
Deputy Clerk

Appendix (E) The Circuit Court CH95-34 " **injunction order** " to set

appellant requested Jury trial date Simultaneous with collateral issue CH95-41 the circuit court **failed to honor**, thought court discretion error, in severe bias & prejudice to injunction airport owner, including **infant** trust beneficiaries.

VIRGINIA: IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SHENANDOAH COUNTY

LINDA F. RANEY,

Complainant

v. **IN CHANCERY NOCH95-34**

A. EDWARD RANEY.

Respondent

DECREE

On this 30th day of August, 1995, came complainant Linda F. Raney in person and by counsel, and respondent not appearing and not represented by counsel, for a pre-trial conference.

Appendix (E)

Upon consideration of the related case between the parties in this court, Chancery No. 95-41, and respondent's request for a continuance on the equitable distribution issues in that case until respondent's release from incarceration and the other property matters to be resolved between the parties; it is hereby

DECREED that the injunction shall continue pursuant to the same terms set forth in prior orders of this court until further order of this court, and the court will set a final hearing on the injunction at the same time that the cout sets a hearing for the equitable distribution determination in Chancery No. 95-41, with leave to the respondent to file any objection within 30 days of the entry of this order.

Appendix (E)

The Clerk will certify a copy of this decree to respondent at the following address: Mr. A. Edward Raney, SSN 578-28-3493, inmate Number 044425-084, Federal Correction Institute, P.O. Box 1000, River Road, Petersburg, Virginia 23804-1000.

ENTER Dennis Hupp
DATE September 7, 1995

Bonnie L. Paul
Bonnie L. Paul, Esquire
Layman & Nichols, P.C.
268 Newman Avenue
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801
Counsel for complainant

True copy teste:
Denise F. Barb, Clerk
By Glenda J. Shuman, D.C.

Appendix (F)Settler, family trust **trustee removal,** improbity violation of airport stock trust transfer agreement.

L. Wayne Harper, Clerk

B1335P214

Trust, Trustee Repeal
General Fiduciary Repeal
Power Of Attorney Repeal

State Of Virginia

02-23-95

By these presents, acknowledged by the undersigned, A. Edward Raney, a/k/a Arlin E. Raney a/k/a Edward Raney Trustee, does repeal forever the power he vested into his wife Linda M. F. Feck a/k/a Linda M. F. Feck Trustee a/k/a Linda M.F. Raney a/k/a Linda M. F. Raney, Trustee, As to all fiduciary powers, powers of attorney personal and as Trustees and inparticularly to a certain unrevokable trust, holding certain real property, cash and other tangibles and intangibles for Linda M.F. Raney, Dagny Virginia Raney, Arlin J. Raney, primary beneficiaries and the undersigned secondary beneficiary Arlin E. Raney, intrust and installsthe succeeding trustee(the undersigned) Arlin E. Raney Settler as the trustee for the herein named named primary and secondary beneficiaries, previously revoked by letter dated 02-8-95 and by recorded phone correspondence 02-9-95 orally conveyed by the undersigned, This repeal

is solely to comply with recording rules of notary acknowledgement where necessary

SIC: regarding the hand pined trustee removal dated 2-23-95

Arlin Edward Raney
Arlin Edward Raney personally
Settler
Trustee

The above undersigned Arlin E. Raney, did appear this day personally And fix his signature and seals X hereto, before me in the state of Virginia

SIGNED
Yolanda Cruz Vazquez

Date 3-17-95 my commission expires 3-31-95

B 729 P 25 Shenandoah County
Denis F. Barb, Clerk

Appendix G Airport stock trust transfer agreement to protect the airport **reserving sole right to operate the airport**

NEW MARKET AIRPORT, INC.

Whereas, on this 20th. day of July, 1987, it is the desire of the president of the New Market Airport, Inc. to protect the said airport, Inc, its holdings and its officer from dealings of the president – A. Edward Raney, both business & personal;

Therefore it is hereby ordered and agreed to by the undersigned president – A. Edward Raney, that 20,000 shares of New Market Airport stock be issued as follows: 19,800 shares to Linda Martha Feck Raney, the presidents wife, and 200 shares (one percent of the total), to the president A. Edward Raney.

Whereas both parties to this issuance of this stock agree that the presidents 200 shares of stock shall hold fifty one percent of the total Stock voting rights. These 200 shares, sold or inherited , shall revert to only one percent of the stocks voting rights, and in no case is the said stock's 51 percent of the voting rights aforementioned .transferable

Signed to and accepted this 20th day of July, 1987.

Signed	Signed
A. Edward Raney, president	Linda Martha Feck Raney

Appendix (H) Blacks law dictionary definition of a
" INTERLOCUTORY "
APPEAL

{ ***INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL.*** An appeal that occurs before the trial courts final ruling on the entire case * some interlocutory appeals involve legal points necessary to the determination of the case, while others involve collateral orders that are wholly separate from the merits of the action Cf, FINAL JUDGMENT RULES }

Appendix (I) Thwarted Children Visitation Application, also, Circuit Court Denied

PETITION Va. Code 16.1-262.3 Case No. T-5118-05

Shenandoah County-------Juvenile & Domestic Relations District Court

In re a child under eighteen years of age:

Raney, Dagny V.	DOB 12-7-89	10 yrs	Fml
Raney, Arlin J.	DOB 4-24-91	9yrs	Ml

Childs Address; 55 River Rd. New Market, Va. 22844

Fathers Name & Address; Raney, Arlin E.;
1020 Old Furnace Rd., Harrisonburg, Va. 22802

Mothers Name & Address, Raney, Linda M.
55 River Rd., New Market, Va. 22844

I, the undersigned petitioner, state under oath to the best of my knowledge, that the above named child is within the purview of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Law in that ,this city / County, the child: is a child whose visitation requires determination as provided by section 16.1-241 (A3) of the 1950 code of Virginia as amended. Wherefore, the petitioner requests that the child and the persons having his or her custody be summoned to appear before this court.

9/29/00 Signed
Arlin E. Raney

Received by the County court Sept. 29, 2000, clerk